

Description	Type of Change	Current Status/Concern	Proposed Improvement	Anticipated Impacts	
				Advantages	Disadvantages
1. <i>§25-1-21 and §30-1-21, Definitions</i> <i>§25-8-321 and §30-5-321, Clearing of Vegetation</i>	Clarification	The current definition of development excludes vegetation clearing for agricultural activity, but the language is confusing for the public, applicants, and staff.	Add a definition of "agricultural operations" and revise the definition of development to specifically exempt vegetation clearing for agricultural operations. Revise §25-8-321 and §30-5-321 to reference agricultural operations.	Clarity.	None.
2. <i>Chapter 25-2 Subchapter B Article 2 Division 5 §2.3, PUD Tier One Requirements</i>	Clarification	One of the PUD Tier 1 requirements is that the project "comply with the City's Planned Unit Development Green Building Program." This language is confusing because there is not a green building program specific to PUDs. Instead, PUDs must provide at least a two-star Austin Energy Green Building rating.	Change "comply with the City's Planned Unit Development Green Building Program" to "provide a two-star Austin Energy Green Building Rating."	Clarity.	None.
3. <i>Chapter 25-2 Subchapter B Article 2 Division 5 §2.4, PUD Tier Two Requirements</i>	Clarification	One of the Tier 2 Environment/Drainage criteria includes an incorrect program name.	Change "the Austin Green Builder Program" to "Austin Energy Green Building." Change "provides a rating under the Austin Green Builder Program of three stars or above" to "provides an Austin Energy Green Building Rating of three stars or above."	Clarity.	None.
4. <i>§25-7-32 and §30-4-32, Director/Single Office Authorized to Require Erosion Hazard Zone Analysis</i>	Clarification	Requirement for Erosion Hazard Zone (EHZ) analysis within 100 feet of the centerline of the waterway does not provide adequate protection for the Colorado River downstream from Longhorn Dam.	Clarify that EHZ analysis is required within 100 feet of the ordinary high water (OHW) mark of the Colorado River downstream from Longhorn Dam.	Clarifies the original intent of the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO).	None.
5. <i>§25-8-1 and §30-5-1, Definitions</i>	Clarification	The term floodplain modification (§25-8-261, §25-8-364, §30-5-261, §30-5-364) is not defined and can be interpreted to mean any development within the floodplain.	Define floodplain modification to mean development that results in any vertical or horizontal change in the cross section of the 100-year floodplain.	Clarity.	None.

Description	Type of Change	Current Status/Concern	Proposed Improvement	Anticipated Impacts	
				Advantages	Disadvantages
6. <i>§25-8-2 and §30-5-2, Descriptions of Regulated Areas</i>	Clarification	Subsection C doesn't specify which boundary needs a 1,500-foot verification zone.	Revise language to clarify that WPD may require boundary verification for any area described in Subsection (D), and that property within 1,500 feet of an Edwards Aquifer recharge zone boundary may require a certified report from a geologist or hydrologist for boundary verification.	Clarity. Codifies current practice.	None.
7. <i>§25-8-25, Redevelopment Exception in Urban and Suburban Watersheds</i>	Clarification	The redevelopment exception for urban and suburban watersheds does not have a provision to allow the redevelopment exception to be used if a subdivision and site plan are filed concurrently, which is allowed in water supply and Barton Springs Zone (BSZ) watersheds.	Add language from §25-8-26/27 that allows the redevelopment exception to be used if subdivision and site plan applications are filed concurrently.	Consistency. Could allow additional properties in urban and suburban watersheds to use the redevelopment exception.	None.
8. <i>§25-8-25/26/27, Redevelopment Exception in All Watersheds</i>	Clarification	The redevelopment exception requires not increasing non-compliance with critical environmental feature (CEF) protections, but it does not specify whether an environmental resource inventory (ERI) is required to identify potential CEFs.	Specify that properties using the redevelopment exception must provide an ERI if applicable under §25-8-121.	Helps implement the existing requirement to demonstrate no increase in non-compliance for CEFs. Codifies current practice.	Additional expense/potential disincentive for redevelopment projects.
9. <i>§25-8-26/27, Redevelopment Exception in the Barton Springs Zone and Water Supply Watersheds</i>	Clarification	One of the current factors for Council approval is whether a proposed redevelopment is compatible with the City's "long range planning goals," which is a vague term.	Replace "long range planning goals" with "comprehensive plan."	Clarity.	None.
10. <i>§25-8-41 and §30-5-41, Land Use Commission Variances</i>	Clarification	Current language for findings of fact is confusing and difficult for applicants to interpret.	Clarify the findings of fact language to better reflect the intent and current staff and land use commission practice.	Variances can be processed in a more efficient and effective manner.	None.
11. <i>§25-8-42 and §30-5-42, Administrative Variances</i> <i>§25-8-341/342 and §30-5-341/342, Cut Requirements, Fill Requirements</i>	Policy	Administrative variances for cut and fill for ponds are nearly always granted, but requiring a variance adds time and expense to the review process.	Remove the administrative variance requirement for cut and fill greater than 4 feet for ponds if the applicant demonstrates that it is necessary for appropriate functioning of the pond and associated drainage infrastructure.	Streamlines review process.	None.

Description	Type of Change	Current Status/Concern	Proposed Improvement	Anticipated Impacts	
				Advantages	Disadvantages
12. <i>§25-8-63 and §30-5-63, Impervious Cover Calculations</i>	Clarification	Applicants have asked whether the exemption for swimming pools applies to rooftop swimming pools.	Clarify that rooftop swimming pools are not exempt from impervious cover calculations.	Prevents additional ramping up of impervious cover at ground level by not allowing a large portion of the building to be exempted.	Argument that impact of rooftop swimming pool is eliminated due to freeboard.
13. <i>§25-8-65 and §30-5-65, Commercial Impervious Cover</i>	Clarification	Current language can be interpreted to mean there is an exemption for all commercial projects with less than 8,000 square feet of new impervious cover.	Clarify that the impervious cover exemption only applies to the listed roadway improvement projects (i.e., intersection upgrades, low-water crossing upgrades, additions for bicycle lanes, and additions for mass transit stops).	Clarifies the original intent of the WPO.	None.
14. <i>§25-8-92 and §30-5-92, Critical Water Quality Zones Established</i>	Clarification	Exemption for drainage features serving a public roadway right-of-way does not apply to similar situations along railroads.	Add exemption for railroad ROW.	Clarity. Addresses the same situation of a modified drainage feature that cannot be restored to a natural condition.	Exempts additional waterways from CWQZ protection.
15. <i>§25-8-92 and §30-5-92, Critical Water Quality Zones Established</i>	Clarification	Current language for urban watersheds can be interpreted to exempt Lady Bird Lake from having a CWQZ within the central business district.	Clarify that the exemption in Section F for the area bounded by IH-35, Riverside, Barton Springs, Lamar, & 15th does not apply to Lady Bird Lake. Lady Bird Lake <u>does</u> have a waterway setback.	Clarity. Codifies current practice.	None.
16. <i>§25-8-92 and §30-5-92, Critical Water Quality Zones Established</i>	Clarification	Critical water quality zone (CWQZ) for Lake Long (a.k.a. "Decker Lake") is measured from the centerline of the waterway, offering limited to no protection for the riparian zone.	Add Lake Long to the list of lakes in Section D to establish a 100-foot CWQZ from the shoreline.	Provides greater protection to the riparian zone along Lake Long. Consistent with CWQZ for other lakes.	Triggers stricter restrictions for recreational development near the shoreline. However, development within the CWQZ is allowed if identified in a Council-approved master plan.
17. <i>§25-8-121 and §30-5-121, Environmental Resource Inventory Requirement</i>	Clarification	Language in section A can be interpreted to apply to a "karst reservoir" instead of a drinking water reservoir.	Revise language to clarify that an ERI is required within the Edwards Aquifer recharge or contributing zone and within the Drinking Water Protection Zone.	Clarity.	None.

Description	Type of Change	Current Status/Concern	Proposed Improvement	Anticipated Impacts	
				Advantages	Disadvantages
18. <i>§25-8-121 and §30-5-121, Environmental Resource Inventory Requirement</i>	Clarification	Language in section A states that an ERI is required when development is proposed in a CWQZ, water quality transition zone (WQTZ), or floodplain, but current practice is to require an ERI when a CWQZ, WQTZ, or floodplain is located anywhere on the site.	Revise language to say "on a tract containing" a WQTZ, CWQZ, or floodplain.	Codifies current practice.	None.
19. <i>§25-8-211 and §30-5-211, Water Quality Control Requirement</i>	Clarification	Current language could be interpreted to apply to all types of roadway projects, not just the identified roadway improvements.	Change "roadway project" to "roadway improvement."	Clarity.	None.
20. <i>§25-8-261 and §30-5-261, Critical Water Quality Zone Development</i>	Clarification	The language allowing hard surface trails that do not cross the CWQZ could be interpreted to mean that trail crossings are not allowed. Multiuse trail crossings are allowed under §25-8-262 and §30-5-262.	Clarify that trail crossings are allowed pursuant to §25-8-262 and §30-5-262, and trails that do not cross the CWQZ are allowed pursuant to the listed conditions.	Clarity.	None.
21. <i>§25-8-261 and §30-5-261, Critical Water Quality Zone Development</i>	Clarification	Requirements for certain uses (e.g., trails, urban agriculture, utilities) to be located a minimum distance from the centerline of the waterway do not provide adequate protection for lakes and rivers.	Clarify that the minimum setback is 50 feet from the shoreline along lakes and 100 feet from the OHW mark of the Colorado River.	Clarifies the original intent of the WPO.	None.
22. <i>§25-8-261 and §30-5-261, Critical Water Quality Zone Development</i>	Clarification	The intent of the WPO was to allow in-channel detention basins and wet ponds if they comply with design criteria in the ECM. Current language does not reference the design criteria, and the reference to floodplain modification criteria is unnecessary.	Clarify that in-channel detention basins and wet ponds are allowed if they comply with the design criteria in the ECM.	Clarifies the original intent of the WPO.	None.
23. <i>§25-8-261 and §30-5-261, Critical Water Quality Zone Development</i> <i>§25-8-364 and §30-5-364, Floodplain Modification</i>	Clarification	Unclear what kind of floodplain modification/CWQZ development qualifies as "necessary to protect public health and safety."	Specify that the floodplain modifications must address an existing threat to public health and safety, as determined by the Watershed Protection Department.	Clarity. Codifies current practice.	None.

Description	Type of Change	Current Status/Concern	Proposed Improvement	Anticipated Impacts	
				Advantages	Disadvantages
24. §25-8-261 and §30-5-261, <i>Critical Water Quality Zone Development</i>	Clarification	Adding a CWQZ along the shoreline of Lake Long could impact future development at the Decker Creek Power Station.	Allow development associated with the Decker Creek Power Station to be located within the CWQZ.	Provides flexibility for new development for an existing use.	Allows new development to be located in the CWQZ without a variance.
25. §25-8-261 and §30-5-261, <i>Critical Water Quality Zone Development</i>	Clarification	Subsection J is not necessary, because there is not a CWQZ on the described waterways per §25-8-92 and §30-5-92.	Delete subsection J.	Clarity.	None.
26. §25-8-262 and §30-5-262, <i>Critical Water Quality Zone Street Crossings</i>	Clarification	Proposed change to allow 900 foot spacing for crossings of minor waterways outside of the drinking water protection zone was inadvertently dropped in later draft of the WPO.	Change minimum spacing for collector street crossings from 1,000 feet to 900 feet for minor waterways.	Clarifies the original intent of the WPO.	None.
27. §25-8-341 and §30-5-341, <i>Cut Requirements</i>	Clarification	Current practice of not applying cut requirements to swimming pools is not codified.	Clarify that cut requirements do not apply to swimming pools.	Clarity. Codifies current practice.	None.
28. §25-8-361 and §30-5-361, <i>Wastewater Restrictions</i>	Clarification	Use of the word "treatment" in "wastewater treatment by land application" makes it unclear whether this section applies to application of treated wastewater effluent, which is the intent.	Change "wastewater treatment by land application" to "land application of treated wastewater effluent," which clarifies that the section applies to facilities that dispose of treated effluent by land application.	Clarity.	None.
29. §25-8-361 and §30-5-361, <i>Wastewater Restrictions</i>	Clarification	Language prohibiting wastewater application on "trunk of surveyed trees" may be applied to additional trees not required to be surveyed by code.	Change "trunk of surveyed trees" to "trunk of trees required to be surveyed as prescribed in the ECM."	Clarity.	None.
30. §25-8-364 and §30-5-364, <i>Floodplain Modification</i>	Clarification	The relationship between the floodplain modification criteria in §25-8-261/§30-5-261 and §25-8-364/§30-5-364 is confusing; it is unclear which parts of 364 apply to floodplain modifications within the CWQZ.	Clarify that the conditions in §25-8-364(C)/§30-5-364(C) only apply to floodplain modifications outside of a CWQZ, and that the conditions in §25-8-364(D)/§30-5-364(D) apply to all floodplain modifications.	Clarity.	None.
31. §25-8-453 and §30-5-453, <i>Uplands Zone</i>	Clarification	List of uses allowed within the 40 percent buffer do not include water quality controls, which are allowed pursuant to §25-8-213(C)(3) and §30-5-213(C)(3).	Add a reference to §25-8-213(C)(3) and §30-5-213(C)(3), allowing water quality controls under certain conditions.	Consistency.	None.

Description	Type of Change	Current Status/Concern	Proposed Improvement	Anticipated Impacts	
				Advantages	Disadvantages
32. <i>§25-8-514 and §30-5-514, Pollution Prevention Required</i>	Policy	List of pollutants includes Total Organic Carbon (TOC), which has many natural sources and is not necessarily an indicator of anthropogenic pollution in stormwater. TOC, like Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD), measures the organic matter in water, but COD is a better indicator of the impact on dissolved oxygen. COD is thus more relevant to receiving water quality.	Remove Total Organic Carbon from the list of pollutants.	Conform with best practice.	None.
33. <i>§25-8-516 and §30-5-516, Application to Existing Tracts, Platted Lots, and Public Schools</i>	Clarification	Current language could be interpreted to apply to all types of roadway projects, not just the identified roadway improvements.	Change "roadway project" to "roadway improvement."	Clarity.	None.
34. <i>§25-8-606, Report</i>	Clarification	The Urban Forestry Board was merged with the Environmental Commission, but the City Arborist's reporting requirements were not updated.	Delete the monthly reporting requirement that previously applied to the Urban Forestry Board.	Clarity.	None.
35. <i>§25-8-643, Land Use Commission Variance</i> <i>§25-8-644, Appeal</i>	Clarification	The Urban Forestry Board was merged with the Environmental Commission, but the process for land use commission variances and appeals was not updated.	Clarify that land use commission variances and appeals must be reviewed by the Environmental Commission.	Clarity.	None.
36. <i>§25-8-692, Endangered Species</i> <i>§25-8-696, Notice</i>	Clarification	The notification requirements apply to endangered species but not threatened species, such as the Jollyville Plateau salamander, which are also protected under the Endangered Species Act.	Require notification for the Jollyville Plateau salamander.	Clarity.	None.
37. <i>§25-8-696, Notice</i>	Clarification	It is not clear whether staff can ask the applicant to contact the required agencies (as opposed to staff making the notification).	Clarify that the applicant needs to make the notification.	Clarity. Codifies current practice.	None.
38. <i>§25-8-696, Notice</i>	Clarification	Includes reference to Texas Parks & Wildlife Department (TPWD) Natural Heritage Program, which no longer exists.	Generalize reference to TPWD and add requirement to notify Travis or Williamson County.	Clarity.	None.

Description	Type of Change	Current Status/Concern	Proposed Improvement	Anticipated Impacts	
				Advantages	Disadvantages
39. §30-5-41, <i>Land Use Commission Variances</i>	Clarification	The supplemental findings of fact in §25-8-41(B) apply to variances from WQTZ requirements in the water supply and Barton Springs Zone watersheds. However, §30-5-41(B) only applies to WQTZ requirements in the water supply watersheds; the BSZ section was inadvertently omitted during the WPO.	Add a reference to §30-5-482 to ensure that the land use commission variance process is the same within the City limits and the extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ).	Consistency. Clarifies the original intent of the WPO.	None.
40. §30-5-341, <i>Cut Requirements</i>	Clarification	§25-8-341(A) and §30-5-341(A) are written slightly differently. Under §25-8-341(A), cut for a wastewater drain field must be restored to natural grade. §30-5-341(A) does not include that requirement.	Clarify that cut for a wastewater drain field must be restored to natural grade to ensure that the cut requirements are the same within the City limits and the ETJ.	Consistency.	None.
41. §30-5-514, <i>Pollution Prevention Required</i>	Clarification	The WPO removed fecal streptococci from the list of pollutants in §25-8-514 but not §30-5-514.	Remove fecal streptococci from the list of pollutants to ensure that water quality treatment standards are the same within the City limits and the ETJ.	Consistency. Clarifies the original intent of the WPO.	None.